



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,575	03/25/2004	Arjan De Mes	GB920030013US1	7131
46370	7590	05/29/2008	EXAMINER	
SILVY ANNA MURPHY 100 TURNBERRY LANE CARY, NC 27518			MAHMOOD, REZWANUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	
			05/29/2008	DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,575	DE MES, ARJAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	REZWANUL MAHMOOD	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 34-41 and 46-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 34-41 and 46-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on February 19, 2008.

Response to Amendment

2. Claims 34-41 and 46-53 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34-41 and 46-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharif (US Publication 2003/0115167) in view of Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671).

With respect to claim 34, Horn discloses a method for displaying a web browsing history, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying a list of names of web sites visited by a user, said list of names of said web sites being displayed in an order based on a time since last visit by

said used to a respective web site of said web sites being displayed in said list; wherein displaying does not include displaying either a time or a date with said web sites (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10);

However, Sharif does not explicitly disclose:

displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites being displayed.

The Bailey reference, however, discloses displaying a graphic rating (zero to five stars) of displayed result items, the number of stars corresponds to the level of significance of a result to a search query (Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sharif with the teachings of Bailey to display next to each web site name a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to the time since last visit by a user for displaying results according to levels of significance to a user's search query (Bailey: Column 2, lines 29-32).

With respect to claim 35, Sharif in view of Bailey discloses a method as set forth in claim 34, said intensity of said graphic next to a name of a respective newer web site in said list of names of web sites is more intense for a newer web site more recently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective

graphic next to another name of another older web site in said list of names of said web site that corresponds to an older web site less recently visited by said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Here the number of stars in the graphic correspond to the significance of a result, the graphic can have higher number of stars for recently visited sites and lower number of stars for less recently visited sites).

6. Claims 36-41 and 46-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharif (US Publication 2003/0115167) in view of Bailey (US Patent 6,785,671) as applied to claims 34-35 above, and further in view of Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351).

With respect to claim 36, Sharif in view of Bailey discloses a method as set forth in claim 34, however Sharif and Bailey do not explicitly disclose wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site comprises a color other than a shade of gray.

The Sommerer reference, however, discloses claimed graphics having a color other than a shade of gray (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the matches to a search query are highlighted in varied intensity of colors reflecting the quality of the match).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sharif and

Bailey with the teachings of Sommerer to have a color other than a shade of gray for the graphics to provide a browser session navigation tool that allows a user to browse a complete record of user navigation (Sommerer: Paragraph 8, lines 2-4).

With respect to claim 37, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a method as set forth in claim 34 wherein said respective graphic next to said respective newer web site in said list of names of said web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another older web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to said list of names of said web sites (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the graphics for multiple results can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics, they form a gradient bar).

With respect to claim 38, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a method for displaying a web browsing history, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying a list of names of web sites visited by a user, said list of names of said web sites being displayed in an order based on frequency of visits by said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10); and

displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to a respective web site in said list of names of said web sites; wherein displaying does not include displaying either a time or a date with said web sites (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27).

With respect to claim 39, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a method as set forth in claim 38 wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective web site in said list of names of web sites is more intense for a web site more frequently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another web site in said list of names of said web sites that corresponds to another web site less frequently visited by said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the number of stars in the graphic correspond to the significance of a result, the graphic can have higher number of stars for recently visited sites and lower number of stars for less recently visited sites).

With respect to claim 40, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a method as set forth in claim 38, wherein said respective

graphic next to said respective web site comprises a color other than a shade of gray (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the matches to a search query are highlighted in varied intensity of colors reflecting the quality of the match).

With respect to claim 41, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a method as set forth in claim 38 wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site in said list of names of said web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to said list of names of said web sites (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Here the graphics for multiple results can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics, they form a gradient bar).

With respect to claim 46, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product stored on a computer readable medium for displaying to a user a web browsing history on a computer system having a central processing unit, said computer program product comprising:
a computer readable media (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35);
first program instructions to display a list of names of web sites visited by a user, said list of names of said web sites being displayed in an order based on

a time since last visit by said user to a respective web site of said web sites displayed in said list (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10); and wherein

second program instructions to display, next to each of said names of said web sites of a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed; wherein said list of names of said web sites displayed does not display either a time or a date with said web sites in said list (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27); and wherein

said first and second program instructions are recorder on said medium for execution by said central processing unit of said computer system for displaying to said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10).

With respect to claim 47, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 46 wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective newer web site in said list of names of web sites is more intense for a newer web site more recently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another older web site in said list of names of web sites that corresponds to an older web site less recently visited by said user

(Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the number of stars in the graphic correspond to the significance of a result, the graphic can have higher number of stars for recently visited sites and lower number of stars for less recently visited sites).

With respect to claim 48, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 46 wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site comprises a color other than a shade of gray (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the matches to a search query are highlighted in varied intensity of colors reflecting the quality of the match).

With respect to claim 49, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 46 wherein said respective graphic next to said respective newer web site in said list of names of said web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another older web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to said list of names of said web sites (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Here the graphics for multiple results can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web

site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics, they form a gradient bar).

With respect to claim 50, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product stored on a computer readable medium for displaying to user a web browsing history on a computer system having a central processing unit, said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable medium (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10);

first program instructions to display a list of names of web sites visited by a user, said names of said web sites being displayed in an order based on frequency of visits by said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10); and

second program instructions to display, next to each of said names of said web sites, of a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to a respective web site in said list of names of said web sites; wherein said list of names of said web sites does not display either a time or a date with said web sites in said list (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27); and wherein

said first and second program instructions are recorded on said medium for execution by said central processing unit of said computer system for

displaying to said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10).

With respect to claim 51, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 50 wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective web site in said list of names of web sites is more intense for a web site more frequently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another web site in said list of names of said web sites that corresponds to another web site less frequently visited by said user (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the number of stars in the graphic correspond to the significance of a result, the graphic can have higher number of stars for recently visited sites and lower number of stars for less recently visited sites).

With respect to claim 52, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 51 wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site comprises a color other than a shade of gray (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the matches to a search query are highlighted in varied intensity of colors reflecting the quality).

With respect to claim 53, Sharif in view of Bailey and in further view of Sommerer discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 51 wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site in said list of names of web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to list of names of said web sites (Sharif: Paragraph 35, lines 1-35; Paragraph 63, lines 1-15; Paragraph 67, lines 1-18; Figures 8-10; Bailey: Column 2, lines 30-43; Column 10, lines 42-46; Figure 4; Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Here the graphics for multiple results can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics, they form a gradient bar).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Abaijan reference (US Patent 6,785,688) teaches about extracting metadata and grouping search results according to the attributes of the metadata. The Freeman reference (US Patent 6,638,313) teaches about a document stream operating system. The Sommerer reference (US Publication 2004/0001104) teaches about a resource browser session search. The Fries reference (US Publication 2002/0147724) teaches about a system for enhancing a query interface). The Adar reference (US Patent 6,493,702) teaches about searching and recommending documents in a collection using share bookmarks. The Martino reference (US Publication 2003/0160759) teaches about a method

and system for displaying search results. The Englefield reference (US Patent 5,896,491) teaches about a system and method for executing functions associated with function icons. The Li reference (US Patent 6,631,496) teaches about a system for organizing and managing web systems.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REZWANUL MAHMOOD whose telephone number is (571)272-5625. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 10 A.M. - 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164

May 23, 2008

/Shahid Al Alam/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162